

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 457

September 21, 1995, 7:10 p.m.
Page S-14050 Temp. Record

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS/Foreign Affairs Consolidation

SUBJECT: Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . .
. H.R. 1868. Helms (for Dole/Helms) amendment No. 2707 to the committee amendment on page 2, line 25.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 43-57

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$12.34 billion in new budget authority for foreign aid programs in fiscal year (FY) 1996. This amount is \$2.43 billion below the President's request, and \$1.19 billion below the FY 1995 appropriated amount.

The committee amendment on page 2, line 25, would change the amount of the subsidy appropriation for the Export-Import Bank.

The Helms amendment to the committee amendment would authorize the Administration to submit a plan to streamline and consolidate foreign affairs agencies for a 4-year savings of \$3 billion. The Office of Management and Budget would have to certify that \$3 billion in savings would be achieved by the plan. That plan would have to eliminate at least two of the following: the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA); the United States Information Agency (USIA); or the Agency for International Development (AID) and the International Development Cooperation Agency. The functions of the eliminated agencies would be transferred to the State Department. The number of State Department employees would be reduced by 9 percent in FY 1996, by 3 percent more in FY 1997, and by 2 percent more in FY 1998. No new Federal agencies could be created. The plan would become effective 60 calendar days of continuous session after having been submitted to Congress, unless Congress passed a disapproval resolution during those 60 days. If the President failed to exercise his authority under this amendment within 6 months of the date of enactment of this Act, all the above listed agencies would be eliminated and their functions would be transferred to the State Department.

During debate, Senator Leahy moved to table the Helms amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment, those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: Following the vote, the amendment was withdrawn.

(See other side)

YEAS (43)		NAYS (57)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (43 or 93%)	Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (3 or 7%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Akaka	Johnston	Abraham	Hutchison	Baucus		
Biden	Kennedy	Ashcroft	Inhofe	Byrd		
Bingaman	Kerrey	Bennett	Jeffords	Hollings		
Boxer	Kerry	Bond	Kassebaum			
Bradley	Kohl	Brown	Kempthorne			
Breaux	Lautenberg	Burns	Kyl			
Bryan	Leahy	Campbell	Lott			
Bumpers	Levin	Chafee	Lugar			
Conrad	Lieberman	Coats	Mack			
Daschle	Mikulski	Cochran	McCain			
Dodd	Moseley-Braun	Cohen	McConnell			
Dorgan	Moynihan	Coverdell	Murkowski			
Exon	Murray	Craig	Nickles			
Feingold	Nunn	D'Amato	Packwood			
Feinstein	Pell	DeWine	Pressler			
Ford	Pryor	Dole	Roth			
Glenn	Reid	Domenici	Santorum			
Graham	Robb	Faircloth	Shelby			
Harkin	Rockefeller	Frist	Simpson			
Heflin	Sarbanes	Gorton	Smith			
Inouye	Simon	Gramm	Snowe			
	Wellstone	Grams	Specter			
		Grassley	Stevens			
		Gregg	Thomas			
		Hatch	Thompson			
		Hatfield	Thurmond			
		Helms	Warner			

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Those Senators who favor this amendment have given fairly accurate descriptions of the negotiations that have been held in private on Senator Helms' proposal to eliminate three foreign policy agencies and to transfer their functions to the State Department. The only inaccuracy is their statement that a final agreement was reached last night. Two elements were agreed to: to consider the proposal as a free-standing bill; and to limit the number of agencies that would have to be eliminated to one. However, this agreement did not resolve all matters in dispute. We have yet to reach agreement as to whether that free-standing bill would be open to amendment, and we have yet to reach agreement on the amount of savings that should be achieved.

Progress is being made, but it is really unfortunate that these negotiations were necessary. This Congress the spirit of bipartisanship that has normally prevailed on the Foreign Affairs Committee has disappeared. The proposal to eliminate these three agencies was a proposal that was made by Committee Republicans without involving Democrats in the decision in any manner. When Democrats objected, the Committee tried to push the proposal through the Senate without any consideration of Democrats' concerns. That effort failed, and negotiations began, but at the same time nominations have been held up in an effort to coerce Democrats into dropping their opposition.

We are not going to give in to this type of confrontational pressure. We think that streamlining that has already been completed at these three agencies makes further savings from consolidation with the State Department unlikely. However, we know that if the President is presented with this measure, the perception will be that he is against savings if he does the right thing and vetoes it. Further, Members will look as though they are against savings if they vote to sustain the veto. We are confident that we could sustain a veto, but we do not want to put ourselves in that position. Voting to support a motion to table is a much easier vote to cast. We will therefore vote to table this amendment, and all similar amendments, until such time as a reasonable compromise on this issue is reached.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

We have bent over backwards to accommodate our colleagues on our proposal to streamline the United States foreign policy administration. Each concession we have offered, though, has been met with new demands. This pattern of behavior leads us to believe that our colleagues are not interested in compromise. They want only to delay in their effort to preserve the status quo.

This debate began before this amendment. Certain of our colleagues began a filibuster of the State Department Authorization bill precisely because it had language to eliminate three independent foreign policy agencies--ACDA, AID, and USIA--and to give their functions to the State Department, for a savings of \$3 billion. That proposal was favored by former Secretaries of State, and by the current Secretary of State until the Vice President paid him a call to explain exactly why this Administration's idea of reinventing government did not include eliminating redundant agencies. That bill was withdrawn due to the filibuster, which was being conducted to protect President Clinton from having either to accept or veto the bill.

During that debate, several of our colleagues expressed the opinion that the President should be given more flexibility in designing the structure of the United States' foreign policy apparatus. Personally, we see the creation or abolition of Federal agencies as a distinctly legislative function, yet our colleagues nevertheless have said that they wish to cede that authority to the President. Accordingly, we have attempted a compromise with this amendment. This amendment would give the President the flexibility to select one of the three agencies to keep as an independent agency; only two would be consolidated into the State Department. Savings of \$3 billion would still be required.

This compromise proposal has not been accepted by certain Senators. Yesterday, they offered a counter-proposal--introduce the amendment as a freestanding bill and require the elimination of only one agency. We agreed to that proposal, but our colleagues have now said that we misunderstood them; they also want us to reduce the savings to only \$2 billion.

We will not. This debate has been going on since the end of July, and the goal posts seem to shift continually. Our colleagues original complaint dealt with the structure of our foreign policy apparatus, not funding. They did not want Congress dictating the elimination of three agencies. We have agreed to settle for only one agency--we have gone two-thirds of the way in their favor. This settlement is generous, considering that a majority of Senators favor the original proposal to eliminate all three agencies.

Eventually we are going to get some form of this proposal to the President's desk. Despite the furious lobbying of bureaucrats from these agencies, especially AID bureaucrats, this reform effort will not be stopped. Our colleagues may hope to keep this matter bottled up inside of the Senate, away from public scrutiny, but their filibuster will have consequences. As long as they insist on this filibuster, the Foreign Affairs Committee will be too busy trying to move this matter forward to move on nominations that are before it. Senators and the Administration who wish to see certain nominations move forward may have a long wait.

The choice is theirs. We will have our vote on this amendment, and then we will withdraw it so as not to delay this bill's passage, but this issue will be back. For now, we urge our colleagues to vote against the motion to table.